

REMARKS

The objections to the claims have been overcome by amendment. Withdrawal is requested.

Claims 22-27 and 29 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of Watanabe et al. '401 and Chan et al. '671. Applicant traverses this rejection because even when combined, the cited references do not disclose or suggest a cut-off switch in which the first and second contacts are fixed, and the distance between the second movable contact and the second fixed contact is greater than the distance between the first movable contact and the first fixed contact when the first and second movable contacts are away from the first and second fixed contacts, as in independent claim 23.

Independent claim 23 has been amended to more clearly define the arrangement of the contacts and PTC of the present invention. With this configuration, the distance between a second movable contact and the second fixed contact is greater than a distance between a first movable contact and a first fixed contact, when the movable contacts are away from the fixed contacts. This creates a time lag that occurs when the movable contacts are separated from the fixed contacts.

Independent claim 23 reads on the configuration of Figs. 8A, 8B and 8C. However, Figs. 8A, 8B and 8C are merely circuit diagrams and do not illustrate specific hardware configurations. Figs. 7A, 7B and 7C do describe hardware configurations, which are helpful in better understanding the present invention. Reference numerals 41-1, 41-2, 42-1 and 42-2 in Figs. 8A, 8B and 8C correspond to 37-1, 37-2, 31-1 and 32-2 in Figs. 7A, 7B

and 7C, respectively. However, the line that connects the numberless power supply side and load side in Figs. 8A, 8B and 8C are not shown in Figs. 7A, 7B and 7C. To form the same configuration of Figs. 8A, 8B and 8C in Figs. 7A, 7B and 7C, a connecting section would be provided outside the housing 32, and would connect the power supply side and the load side to the connecting section and switch opposite the PTC 39 connection that is connected to the movable plate 36. Thus, Figs. 8A, 8B and 8C show the circuit diagram describing claim 22, and Figs. 7A, 7B and 7C show the hardware configuration which creates the time lag occurring when the movable contacts are separated from their fixed contacts.

The examiner recognizes that Watanabe does not disclose the configuration in which a distance between a second movable contact and a second fixed contact is greater than the distance between the first movable contact and the first fixed contact when the contacts are disengaged, and relies on Chen for this feature. However, Chen discloses that contacts 18, 20 break contact before contacts 22, 24 as a result of the asymmetrical blade 30 (Col. 4, lines 44-45), not the configuration of the fixed contacts, as in the present invention. Since Chen achieves its purpose of reducing arcing with this configuration, there is no reason to modify Chen by adjusting distances based on the configuration of the fixed contacts. At the most, there is motivation to modify Watanabe in the manner of Chen, which would not produce the present invention. Thus, even combined, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the configuration of the fixed contacts defined in claim 23 of the present application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 stands rejected under § 103 on the basis of Watanabe et al. '401, Chen et al. '671 and Limitor AG '090. Applicant traverses this rejection for the reason given with respect to independent claim 23. Withdrawal is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

February 1, 2008

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978